The 17TH Annual Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition: Intelligent Robots Built by Intelligent Students

Bernard L. Theisen[1]

U.S. Army TARDEC, 6501 E. Eleven Mile Road; Warren, MI 48397-5000

ABSTRACT

The Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition (IGVC) is one of four unmanned systems student competitions that were founded by the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International (AUVSI). The IGVC is a multidisciplinary exercise in product realization that challenges college engineering student teams to integrate advanced control theory, machine vision, vehicular electronics and mobile platform fundamentals to design and build an unmanned ground vehicle. Teams from around the world focus on developing a suite of dual-use technologies to equip their system of the future with intelligent driving capabilities. Over the past 17 years, the competition has challenged undergraduate, graduate and Ph.D. students with real world applications in intelligent transportation systems, the military and manufacturing automation. To date, teams from over 70 universities and colleges have participated. This paper describes some of the applications of the technologies required by this competition and discusses the educational benefits. The primary goal of the IGVC is to advance engineering education in intelligent vehicles and related technologies. The employment and professional networking opportunities created for students and industrial sponsors through a series of technical events over the four-day competition are highlighted. Finally, an assessment of the competition based on participation is presented.

Key words: intelligent robots, autonomous systems, ground vehicles, engineering education, IGVC.

Figure 1: University of Detroit Mercy – THOR PRO, 2009 IGVC 1ST place overall winner.

e-mail: bernard.theisen@us.army.mil, phone: 586-28274-8750

Report Documentation Page

1. REPORT DATE	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED
23 NOV 2009	**N/A**	**-**

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
The 17TH Annual Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition: Intelligent Robots Built by Intelligent Students	5b. GRANT NUMBER
	5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)	5d. PROJECT NUMBER
Bernard L. Theisen	5e. TASK NUMBER
	5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
US Army RDECOM-TARDEC 6501 E 11 Mile Rd Warren, MI 48397-5000, USA	**20380RC**

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
	TACOM/TARDEC
	11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)
	20380RC

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES
The original document contains color images.

14. ABSTRACT

15. SUBJECT TERMS

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE	**SAR**	**15**	
unclassified	**unclassified**	**unclassified**			

1. INTRODUCTION

The Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition (IGVC) is one of four unmanned systems student competitions that were founded by the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International (AUVSI). The IGVC is a multidisciplinary exercise in product realization that challenges college engineering student teams to integrate advanced control theory, machine vision, vehicular electronics and mobile platform fundamentals to design and build an unmanned ground vehicle. Teams from around the world focus on developing a suite of dual-use technologies to equip their system of the future with intelligent driving capabilities. Over the past 17 years, the competition has challenged undergraduate, graduate and Ph.D. students with real world applications in intelligent transportation systems, the military and manufacturing automation. To date, teams from over 70 universities and colleges have participated. This paper describes some of the applications of the technologies required by this competition and discusses the educational benefits. The primary goal of the IGVC is to advance engineering education in intelligent vehicles and related technologies. The employment and professional networking opportunities created for students and industrial sponsors through a series of technical events over the four-day competition are highlighted.

Figure 2: California State University, Northridge - NorMAN Jr, during the Design Competition Finals.

The objective of the competition is to challenge students to think creatively as a team about the evolving technologies of vehicle electronics, controls, sensors, computer science, robotics, and systems integration throughout the design, fabrication and field testing of autonomous intelligent mobile robots. The competition has been highly praised by faculty advisors as an excellent multidisciplinary design experience for student teams, and a number of engineering schools give credit in senior design courses for student participation. Intelligent vehicles have many areas of relevance for both civilian and military applications. Vehicle intelligence can be applied to civilian applications in automating future highways or enhancing the safety of individual automobiles and trucks. For the Department of Defense (DoD), intelligent vehicles have the potential to greatly increase the effectiveness of the Army's Future Force by removing Soldiers from high risk tasks, as well as a desirable high payoff potential in multiplying combat assets, thus increasing unit combat power. Technology objectives identified in both DoD and Department of Transportation (DoT) programs have been used to structure the IGVC. Based on the IGVC technical objectives, a number of co-sponsors have joined to help, fund, and promote the IGVC. Present and past co-sponsors include the AUVSI, U.S. Army Tank Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center (TARDEC), Oakland University (OU), Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) Foundation, Fanuc Robotics, the Automated Highway Systems (AHS) Consortium, General Dynamics Land Systems (GDLS), the United Defense Limited Partnership (UDLP), the DoT, Ford Motor Co., General Motors (GM), Chrysler, Applied Research Associates (ARA), Science Applications International Corp. (SAIC), National Defense Industrial Association (NDIA), Theta Tau, Motorola, CSI Wireless, Microsoft Robotics, Raytheon, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), the DoD Joint Ground Robotics Enterprise (JGRE), the U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) and the Joint Center for Robotics (JCR). A common interest of all these organizations is intelligent vehicles and their supporting technologies. The IGVC challenges the students to design, develop, build, demonstrate, report, and present integrated systems with intelligent technologies which can lane-follow, avoid obstacles, operate without human intervention on slopes, natural environments, and simulated roads, autonomously navigate with global positioning systems (GPS) and to perform leader-follower applications. The civilian aspect of this dual use

technology is underpinned by the automotive applications. The IGVC has three mandatory components and one optional event: a Design Competition, the Autonomous Challenge, the Navigation Challenge and the Joint Architecture for Unmanned Systems (JUAS) Challenge. The total award money amount of all four competitions is currently over $45,000. In the Design Competition, judges determine winners based on written and oral presentations and on examination of the vehicles. While in the Autonomous Challenge, the robotic vehicles negotiate an outdoor obstacle course approximately 200 meters long. The Navigation Challenge requires vehicles to travel from a starting point to a number of target destinations using global positioning system (GPS) waypoints. The JAUS Challenge has two aspects a written/oral presentation which will be added to the Design Competition and a practical demonstration to determine compliance with the architecture.

Figure 3: University of Waterloo – lorek, taking cover from the rain.

2. THE COMPETITION EVENTS

The Autonomous Challenge event requires a fully autonomous unmanned ground robotic vehicle to negotiate around an outdoor obstacle course under the prescribed time of five minutes while staying within the five mile-per-hour speed limit and avoiding obstacles on the track. The course consists of a 600 foot long, ten foot wide lane with white lane markings on grass. Obstacles on the course will consist of various colors (white, orange, brown, green, black, etc.) and include five gallon pails, construction drums, cones, trash cans, pedestals and barricades that are used on roadways and highways. Natural obstacles such as trees or shrubs and manmade obstacles such as light post or street signs could also appear on the course. The obstacles will be part of complex arrangements with switchbacks and center islands. There locations will be adjusted between runs and the direction of the obstacle course may also be changed between heats. Artificial inclines with 15 percent gradients and a sand pit are placed on the course and must be negotiated. The vehicles are judged based on their ability to perceive the course environment and avoid obstacles. A human operator cannot remotely control vehicles during competition. All computational power, sensors, and control equipment must be carried on board the vehicle to achieve autonomous driving with computer vision and obstacle detection technologies. Judges

will rank the entries that complete the course based on shortest adjusted time taken. In the event that a vehicle does not finish the course, the judges will rank the entry based on longest adjusted distance traveled. Adjusted time and distance are the net scores given by judges after taking penalties, incurred from obstacle collisions, pothole hits, and boundary crossings, into consideration. The vehicle that travels the farthest on the course, or completes the course in the shortest time wins; award money for this event totals $10,500.

Figure 4: University of Delaware – Warthog, 1ST place in the Autonomous Challenge.

The Design Competition expects all teams will design and equip their vehicles to compete in the Autonomous and Navigation Challenges and design reports will be judged accordingly. Failure to Qualify for the performance events will result in only nominal prize awards in the design competition. Although the ability of the vehicles to negotiate the competition course is the ultimate measure of product quality, officials are also interested in the design process that engineering teams follow to produce their vehicles. Design judging is performed by a panel of experienced engineering judges and is conducted separate from and without regard to vehicle performance on the test course. Judging is based on a 15 page written report, a 10 minute oral presentation and an examination of the vehicle. In the interest of engineering discipline, design reports that are received after the deadline date are penalized in the judging, as are oral presentations running longer than the specified time. The award money for this event totals $6,000.

The Navigation Challenge event is a practice that is thousands of years old. Procedures have continuously improved from line-of-sight to moss on trees to dead reckoning to celestial observation to the use of global positioning systems (GPS). The challenge in this event is for a vehicle to autonomously travel from a starting point to a number of target destinations (waypoints or landmarks) and return to home base, provided only a map showing the coordinates of those targets. Coordinates of the targets are given in latitude and longitude as well as in meters on an x-y grid. The vehicle thus needs to incorporate GPS technology with computer vision, obstacle detection and avoidance to find and reach the targets. The vehicle visiting the most waypoints in a given (or the shortest) time wins; award money for this event totals $7,750.

The JAUS Challenge verifies that teams are using a standardized message suitable for controlling all types of unmanned systems, and has become SAE AS-4 Unmanned Systems Standard, commonly known as JAUS (Joint Architecture for Unmanned Systems). Participation in the challenge is voluntary, but the challenge is standardized over all of the AUVSI student unmanned competitions. Teams that completed the challenge will send a request for identification to the Common Operating Picture (COP) once every 5 seconds. The COP will respond with the appropriate informative message and request identification in return from the team's JAUS interface. After the identification report from the COP, the team entry will stop repeating the request. This transaction will serve as the discovery between the operator control unit (OCU) via an RF data link and the vehicle. All teams successfully completing the JAUS will receive an award of $500, limit one award per school.

Figure 5: Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University – Reagle 2.0, completing its run on the Navigation Challenge Course.

3. THE COMPETITION RULES (IN BRIEF)

Vehicles must be entirely autonomous and cannot be controlled by a human operator during competition. All computational power, sensing, and control equipment must be carried on board the vehicle; except there must be both a manual and wireless remote emergency stop capability meeting strict specifications. Chassis can be built from scratch or commercially bought (all-terrain vehicle, golf cart, lawn tractor, electric wheel chair, etc.). Overall dimensions cannot exceed seven feet in length, five feet in width and six feet in height. Propulsion must be by direct mechanical contact with the ground, and power must be supplied either electrically or by combustible fuel. Vehicles must have a maximum speed of five mph for safety and must carry a 20 pound load during competition.

The Autonomous Challenge course is laid out on grass with sections of simulated asphalt, a simulated sand pit, and an artificial incline with a 15 percent grade. Lane markers (lines) are painted white and are 10 feet apart. The turning radius is not less than five feet. One section has alternating dashed lines, while another section has no lane markers at all for 15 feet. Obstacles on the course will consist of various colors construction drums, cones, trash cans, pedestals and barricades that are used on roadways and highways. White-painted simulated and actual potholes need to be avoided. Traffic tickets or run terminations are made by the judges for various infringements on the course (crossing the lane markers, striking an obstacle, etc.). The course layout is changed every year and obstacles are moved between runs.

The Navigation Challenge course is run on an unmarked one hectare field or paved parking lot. Waypoints vary in size from two to four meter diameter and are scattered around a single start/finish point, latitude and longitude of each of these targets is given to the participants. The field is broken up by a fence, with three openings, all openings are closed until the start of the run, when only one will open during the run. Construction barrels and other construction barriers are also located in the field so the vehicles cannot reach all waypoints by following straight lines without encountering an obstacle. Teams placing in the competitions are awarded with individual point values for a grand award for the team that

represents best overall performance. For each competition, points will be awarded to each team, placing first through sixth. The team with the most points at the end of the competition wins the Grand Awards which consist of three traveling trophies, the Lescoe Cup, the Lescoe Trophy and the Lescoe Award for first through third place respectively. For completing JAUS Challenge six points, the point breakdown structure for the rest of the events is listed in Table 1.

Place	Autonomous Challenge	Design Competition	Navigation Challenge
1	48	24	36
2	40	20	30
3	32	16	24
4	24	12	18
5	16	8	12
6	8	4	6

Table 1: Grand Award point distribution.

Safety is a prime concern; vehicles that are judged to be unsafe are not allowed to compete. Therefore, participating vehicles must conform to specific safety regulations. These safety requirements include the following criteria, speed limit, E-Stop (manual and a wireless remote) and indemnification agreements. Minimum performance requirements are also required and include lane following, waypoint navigation, obstacle detection and avoidance. These safety and performance requirements will be tested during the Qualification event; all vehicles must qualify to compete in the performance events.

Figure 6: Bluefield State Collage – Anassa V, on the Practice Course.

4. TEAM TECHNOLOGIES

All of the vehicles entered into the IGVC are unique and different in design. Though most of the vehicles entered in the competition can be broken down into three main subsystems, mechanical, electrical and software. Fabrication of such a vehicle requires engineering knowledge from various disciplines. The most well rounded teams will employ engineers from several different fields to handle the needs of the projects scope of work. Some teams even employ business and marketing students to help them make contact with industry and the military for both financial backing and durable goods needed for the project. Mechanical subsystem teams are typically responsible for the chassis, propulsion system and body. The chassis designs for the robots are only limited by the design team's imagination and manufacturing

capability. Some teams build small inexpensive robots which are designed solely for the competition itself, entering multiple robots to increase the number of computer algorithms available to challenge the courses. Other teams build elaborate mechanical designs which are robust enough to be used for multiple robotic competitions. Regardless of which design philosophy a team uses, it is important to document the entire build process as the robot is built. Documentation can greatly improve reports required for the Design Competition.

Before building the robot chassis a team must decide what their strategy for completing courses will be. The object of the autonomous challenge is to navigate obstacles on a curved course, over ramps, and through sand. Therefore, the vehicle requires the mobility to steer around obstacles, and the power to carry a 20 pound payload over ramps. The Navigation Challenge only requires the robot to get from point A to point B as quickly as possible, without going over the five mph speed limit. For obstacle avoidance on the Autonomous Challenge course a team can choose from steering controls such as Ackermann, differential, articulation and omnidirectional steering. All steering strategies have been tried in past IGVC competitions with success limited only by the robustness of the chassis. A properly designed Ackermann or articulating robot can navigate obstacles as well as omnidirectional and differential steering robots. A team should choose whichever steering strategy they feel will best complement the robot's software control.

Figure 7: Princeton University – Argos, on the Autonomous Challenge Course.

After choosing a basic steering design the team should consider how they will store and convert energy on their vehicle. Typically the robots are battery powered electric drive. However, some team teams employ internal combustion engines and even hydrogen powered fuel cell vehicles. So long as the design of the robot is structurally sound and energy transmission complies with relevant industry standards, a team can derive their power from batteries, fuel or fuel cells. Teams should investigate the safe handling practices of each type of energy storage before choosing their power source. Also, a team should research the logistics of their energy source, to make sure it is the best source for their design. For example, gasoline has a high energy density, but converting the energy into rotational and electrical power typically requires more equipment which may mitigate weight savings. Another example, lead acid batteries have a very low

energy density, but they are less expensive and easier to maintain than lithium ion batteries. Current platforms must be able to maneuver through several different types of terrain. The majority of the Autonomous Challenge course and possibly the entire Navigation Challenge course is freshly cut grass. There are parts of the Autonomous Challenge course which consist of sand, wood or tarmac. The terrain may also be wet and muddy. Differential tracked vehicles should be designed to have enough traction to propel them forward, while having enough slippage to control the direction of the vehicle's under steer. All platforms must have enough power to carry itself and the 20 pound payload across the terrain gradients of up to 15%. It is important to design the vehicle to carry extra power because a team cannot replace batteries or refuel once they start a performance event.

Braking is sometimes mechanical, but often results simply when power to the motors is cut off, and/or the very high gear ratios are used between motors and wheels. Suspension systems vary widely from sophisticated shock absorber/spring assemblies to solid mounting. Computers and electronic components are often soft-mounted. Majority of the vehicles are electrically powered, but some have also been powered by internal combustion engines and hydraulic drive. Most vehicles have wheels, either three or four, but some have had two wheels or tracks similar to an army tank. Bodies are sometimes made of composite materials in very stylish, artistic, and creative forms, while others have no body covering at all and look like rolling laboratories.

Electrical subsystem teams are generally responsible for most of the components on the vehicle, such as batteries, computers, sensors, cameras and actuators. A typical vision system consists of a one or several color video or still cameras positioned on top of the vehicle that have to be interfaced with a computer. Frequently used sensors include laser range finders, digital compasses, differential global position systems (DGPS), diffuse sensors, non-contact optical sensors and proximity sensors. Controllers are used for the motors, speed and actuators for steering and suspension. Most vehicles have several computers, though they are not always onboard, they are used for programming and vehicle diagnostics and are connected via hard wire or through a wireless local area network (LAN) connection.

Software teams are responsible for writing the software that controls all of the individual mechanical and electrical devices on the vehicle. Several different computer languages are used to write the code for the vehicles. Some teams are even making their vehicles compliant with JAUS; this is significant because JAUS is emerging as the DoD standard for all unmanned systems. The purpose of JAUS is interoperability between various unmanned systems and subsystems for both commercial and military applications.

Figure 8: IGVC teams rush into the team tent to weather proof their robots from the rain.

Most teams use a closed-loop system for controlling their vehicles. A computer and controller feed information to motor controllers, which send electrical or mechanical energy to power the motors. This moves the vehicle, which is observed by encoders that can measure either the motors movement to determine where and how far the vehicle moved, or can measure the environment to determine how far it has traveled. These encoders then send that data back to the computer which uses it, among other data in determining what to do next. A typical example of a vehicle's software system can often be broken down into main sub systems; for example main navigation algorithm, lane following algorithm, obstacle avoidance algorithm and waypoint algorithm. The main sub systems will take data from the other algorithms and use it to plan its path using 3D mapping to determine go and no go areas to choose an ideal case where there are no uncertainties, using tools, such as differential equations and Extended Kalman Filter algorithms to determine the best path in light of the data and uncertainties in the situation. Many robots used both video camera, single or stereo cameras and laser range data to create these 3D maps of the area. The laser range finders are often mounted less than a foot above the ground, looking parallel to the ground.

The video cameras however, are often mounted several feet above the ground, looking downward at a 45 degree angle. This presented a problem to the teams, requiring them to determine how to integrate both sensors into the map and still utilize the sensors' capabilities. One way to do this was to convert the video data into laser range data format, and place it on the semicircle map created by the laser range finder.

The laser range finder map is converted into a form of x-y coordinates, which are then used to plan the path of the vehicle, looking forward at future movements and plotting its course on this 3D map. To do this, decision-making algorithms try to find a path to the end of their sensor range. If they cannot do this, they find the best possible path at a closer range, where new sensor data may generate new paths. Otherwise, like human drivers, the vehicles will back up and try another path. Teams often incorporated a lane-continuation algorithm into their controllers, so that if a lane on either edge of the path disappeared for a distance, it would "extend" that line and maintain its course within that line as if it were still observed. Several teams are now using a systems engineering team to link all the subsystems together and make sure that all the pieces fit together. If systems are conflicting their responsibility is to determine what is causing the problem.

Then they can address the problem by either eliminating unnecessary equipment or software, or they can determine a new unique solution to solve the problem. The engineering challenge is to successfully build, integrate, test, tune and control the vehicle to meet the competition challenges within the time and resource constraints.

Figure 9: Senator Carl Levin welcomed the students and faculty as the keynote speaker in the opening ceremonies.

5. THE 2009 COMPETITION

The 17th Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition was held on June 2-8, 2009 at Oakland University in Rochester, Michigan. This year's competition was the largest to date drawing 52 teams to attempt the challenge, due to complications only 43 teams appeared at the competition. This year's event was international, as teams from U.S and Canada competed. Throughout the practice and qualification weekend, additional hardware and computer realities eliminated 11 more participants for a total of 32 teams qualifying for the performance events. During the performance events mother nature decided to throw another obstacle at the teams by providing light to moderate rain all day long.

The Autonomous Challenge, an IGVC original event, requires the robots to drive a grass course, performing line-following and obstacle avoidance while driving over a ramp, through a sand pit, avoiding simulated potholes and keeping between dashed line markings. University of Delaware's Warthog completed 550 foot of the course before running out of time at the five minute mark and received $3,000 in award money. University of Detroit Mercy's THOR PRO completed 535 feet of the course before their five minute time limit expired, but still managed to take home second place and $2,500 in award money. Bluefield State Collage's Anassa V came in third place with 526 feet in 3 minutes and 8 seconds taking home $2,000 in award money.

Place	School	Team	Distance	Time
1	University of Delaware	Warthog	550	5:00
2	University of Detroit Mercy	THOR PRO	535	5:00
3	Bluefield State College	Anassa V	526	3:08
4	City College of New York	Elvis	437	4:02
5	Michigan Technological University	BAMF	379	4:49
6	Georgia Institute of Technology	Candiii	235	5:00
7	Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University	Reagle 2.0	220	3:37
8	Lawrence Technological University	Culture Shock	201	5:00
9	University of Wisconsin - Madison	Paradroid	200	3:30
10	University of Cincinnati	Bearcat Cub Micro	175	5:00
11	Bob Jones University	Dionysius	120	3:54
12	Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering	Brian	112	2:54
13	University of Massachusetts - Lowell	MCP 3.5	105	1:06
14	University of Michigan – Dearborn	Wolf	84	1:24
15	University of Michigan – Dearborn	Raptor	75	0:58
16	Princeton University	Argos	75	1:12
17	University of Illinois - Chicago	Enyo	70	2:45
18	Trinity Collage	Q	70	5:00
19	École de technologie supérieure	RS3	65	2:45
20	United States Naval Academy	Robo-Goat	60	0:54
21	Oakland University	Moonwalker	54	0:22
22	Tennessee Technological University	Andros	53	1:06
23	California State University – Northridge	NorMAN Jr	50	3:00
24	Lawrence Technological University	Viper 2	16	0:14
25	SUNY University at Buffalo	Big Blue	16	1:15
26	California State University – Chico	Step 5	15	0:15
27	University of Texas - Austin	BlastyRAS++	11	1:46
28	Pennsylvania State University	Lion One	10	0:24
29	Pennsylvania State University	Teletraan 1	10	0:55
30	University of Waterloo	Lorek	7	0:23

Table 2: Autonomous Challenge results

The Design Competition component of the IGVC has been held for 15 of the 17 years the competition has been held. Judges for this competition are chosen to reflect commercial and military applications of intelligent vehicles. Two weeks prior to the IGVC, teams sent their technical papers to the judges for review. The teams were then randomly split into either Design Group A or Design Group B. During the competition each Design Group presented their design to a different group of independent judging panels. Each panel selected their top three teams and those teams presented their design presentation to the other panel of judges. Then both judging panels merge to score the top six finalists to determine a winner. The presentations and technical papers were evaluated and scored. University of Wisconsin - Madison's Paradroid design won first place and $2,000 in award money; University of Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University's Reagle 2.0 took second place and $1,500 in award money and Cornell University's MineSweeper took third and $400 in award money.

Design Finalist			
Place	School	Team	Score
1	University of Wisconsin - Madison	Paradroid	959.33
2	Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University	Reagle 2.0	954.33
3	Cornell University	MineSweeper	946.85
4	Lawrence Technological University	Culture Shock	942.20
5	California State University - Northridge	NorMAN Jr.	937.32
6	University of Detroit Mercy	THOR PRO	894.30
Design Group A			
Place	School	Team	Score
1	Cornell University	MineSweeper	948.50
2	California State University - Northridge	NorMAN Jr.	922.00
3	University of Detroit Mercy	THOR PRO	906.00
4	Lawrence Technological University	Viper II	898.50
5	Missouri University of Science and Technology	Aluminator	878.00
6	École de technologie supérieure	RS3	873.67
7	California State University – Chico	STEP 5	853.00
8	University of Delaware	Warthog	850.00
9	Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering	Brian	838.67
10	SUNY University at Buffalo	Big Blue	831.67
11	Pennsylvania State University	Teletraan I	803.33
12	Bluefield State College	Archon	790.67
13	University of Florida	OmniGator	788.33
14	Oakland University	Moonwalker	737.83
15	University of Cincinnati	Bearcat Cub Micro	718.00
16	Case Western Reserve University	ALEN	681.00
17	Tennessee Technological University	Andros	677.67
18	University of Texas – Arlington	Crazy Horze	624.33
19	United States Naval Academy	Robo-Goat	622.00
20	University of Michigan – Dearborn	Rhino	568.50
21	Georgia Institute of Technology	Candiii	533.00
22	Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology	RATT	476.67
Design Group B			
Place	School	Team	Score
1	Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University	Reagle 2.0	979.00
2	University of Wisconsin - Madison	Paradroid	959.50
3	Lawrence Technological University	Culture Shock	935.50

4	Princeton University	Argos	930.00
5	University of Nebraska	INVADR	913.00
5	Pennsylvania State University	Lion One	904.00
7	University of Waterloo	lorek	897.00
8	University of Michigan – Dearborn	Raptor	875.50
9	University of Illinois - Chicago	Enyo	867.00
10	Michigan Technological University	BAMF	866.50
11	Bluefield State College	Anassa V	856.50
12	Trinity College	Q	797.00
13	University of Texas - Austin	BlastyRAS++	795.00
14	University of Massachusetts – Lowell	MCP III.5	771.50
15	University of Michigan – Dearborn	Wolf	737.00
16	City College of New York	Elvis	728.00
17	Bob Jones University	Dinosysius	666.00
18	Case Western Reserve University	HARLIE	653.00
19	Wayne State University	WAVE	588.00
20	Stony Brook University	TINA	505.00
21	Rochester Institute of Technology	AMOS III	471.00

Table 3: Design Competition results.

Place	School	Team	Points	Time
1	Princeton University	Argos	9	6:13
2	University of Detroit Mercy	THOR PRO	8	6:10
3	University of Delaware	Warthog	7	5:13
4	Bluefield State College	Anassa V	7	6:10
5	University of Massachusetts – Lowell	MCP III.5	6	3:03
6	Lawrence Technological University	Culture Shock	6	3:22
7	Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University	Reagle 2.0	5	2:40
8	Tennessee Technological University	Andros	5	7:56
9	United States Naval Academy	Robo-Goat	4	2:48
10	University of Wisconsin - Madison	Paradroid	4	4:24
11	Oakland University	Moonwalker	4	6:25
12	California State University - Northridge	NorMan Jr	2	1:28
13	Bob Jones University	Dionysius	2	1:30
14	University of Cincinnati	Bearcat Cub Micro	2	3:18
15	SUNY University at Buffalo	Big Blue	1	0:07
16	Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering	Brian	1	0:16
17	Lawrence Technological University	Viper 2	1	0:30
18	California State University – Chico	Step 5	0	0:00
18	École de technologie supérieure	RS3	0	0:00
18	Michigan Technological University	BAMF	0	0:00
18	University of Michigan - Dearborn	Raptor	0	0:00
18	University of Michigan – Dearborn	Rhino	0	0:00
18	University of Michigan – Dearborn	Wolf	0	0:00
18	University of Texas - Austin	BlastyRAS++	0	0:00

Table 4: Navigation Challenge results.

The Navigation Challenge in its ninth year demonstrated agile maneuvers based on navigating between a set of nine different GPS waypoints. The challenge was enhanced by deliberately setting obstacles between the waypoints. Teams had to optimize their routing while integrating machine vision to avoid the obstacles. Princeton University's Argos came in first, completing all nine waypoints in six minutes and 13 seconds and receiving $2,500 in award money. University of Detroit Mercy's THOR PRO came in second place, by completing eight waypoints in six minutes and ten seconds and receiving $2,000 in award money. Third place went to University of Delaware's Warthog, completing seven waypoints in five minutes and 13 seconds and received $1,500 in award money.

The JAUS Challenge in its fourth year had 14 teams attempt the challenge and 11 teams completed it. The challenge verified that teams are using a standardized message suitable for controlling all types of unmanned systems, were sent a request for identification to the COP every few seconds. The COP then responded with the appropriate informative message and request identification in return from the interface. After the identification report from the COP, the vehicles stopped repeating the request. This transaction served as the discovery between the OCU and the vehicle. Teams that completed the JAUS Challenge and received the $500 award were: Case Western Reserve University's HARLIE, Lawrence Technological University's Viper II, Princeton University's Argos, Rochester Institute of Technology's AMOS III, SUNY University at Buffalo's Big Blue, Tennessee Technological University's Andros, University of Detroit Mercy's THOR PRO, University of Florida's OmniGator, University of Waterloo's lorek, University of Wisconsin – Madison's Paradroid and Wayne State University's WAVE.

The Rookie-of-the-Year Award is given to a team from a new school competing for the first time ever or a school that has not participated in the last five competitions. To win the Rookie-of-the-Year Award the team must be the best of the eligible teams competing and perform to the minimum standards of the following events. In the Design Competition you must pass Qualification, in the Autonomous Challenge you must pass the Rookie Barrel and in the Navigation Challenge you must make three waypoints. The United States Naval Academy entered their first every entry, Robo-Goat, into the competition, though their performance was better than the four other rookie teams, they did not make the minimal requirements and only took home $500 in award money.

Place	School	Team	Total
1	University of Detroit Mercy	THOR PRO	80
2	University of Delaware	Warthog	72
3	Bluefield State College	Anassa V	50
4	Princeton University	Argos	42
5	University of Wisconsin – Madison	Paradroid	30
6	City College of New York	Elvis	24
7	Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University	Reagle 2.0	20
8	Lawrence Technological University	Culture Shock	18
9	Michigan Technological University	BAMF	16
10	University of Massachusetts – Lowell	MCP III.5	12
11	California State University - Northridge	NorMAN Jr.	8
11	Cornell University	MineSweeper	8
11	Georgia Institute of Technology	Candiii	8
12	Lawrence Technological University	Viper II	6
12	Rochester Institute of Technology	AMOS III	6
12	SUNY University at Buffalo	Big Blue	6
12	Tennessee Technological University	Andros	6
12	University of Waterloo	lorek	6
13	Case Western Reserve University	HARLIE	2
13	University of Florida	OmniGator	2
13	Wayne State University	WAVE	2

Table 5: Grand Award results.

The Grand Award this year went to University of Detroit Mercy's THOR PRO with a total of 80 points taking home the Lescoe Cup. Second place and the Lescoe Trophy went to University of Delaware's Warthog with 72 points. Third place and the Lescoe Award went to the Bluefield State College's Anassa V with 50 points. Table 5 has a breakdown of all the teams that scored points toward the Grand Award.

Figure 10: University of Wisconsin, Madison – Paradroid, on the Autonomous Challenge Course.

6. CONCLUSION

The Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition has changed astonishingly over the past 17 years. It is the largest of all the AUVSI student unmanned systems competitions, drawing hundreds of students from dozens of universities in several different countries allowing them to excel each year in the application of cutting-edge technologies in engineering and computer science that have direct application in transportation, military, manufacturing, agriculture, recreation, space exploration, and many other fields. They have utilized professional design procedures and performed hands-on fabrication and testing. At the same time they have learned to work in teams and to understand the full product realization process. They have been creative and have at times demonstrated system and technology brilliance. The students are ready for full careers in the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) engineering community. The IGVC is currently preparing for its 18TH competition on June 4-7, 2010 at Oakland University in Rochester, Michigan. Visit the IGVC website at www.igvc.org for more information.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

1. Theisen, B.L., "The 16TH Annual Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition: Intelligent Students Creating Intelligent Vehicles" **IS&T/SPIE Electronic Imaging Science and Technology**, San Jose, CA, January 18-22, 2009.

2. Theisen, B.L., "The 15TH Annual Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition: Intelligent Ground Robots Created by Intelligent Students" **SPIE International Symposium Optics East**, Boston, MA, September 9-12, 2007.

3. Theisen, B.L., D. Nguyen, "The 14th Annual Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition: Intelligent Teams Creating Intelligent Ground Robots" **SPIE International Symposium Optics East**, Boston, MA, October 1-4, 2006.

4. Theisen, B.L., G.R. Lane, "The Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition: Intelligent Teams Creating Intelligent Ground Vehicles" NDIA Paper No. IVSS-2006-UGV-04, **NDIA Intelligent Vehicle Systems Symposium & Exhibition**, Traverse City, MI, June 13-15, 2006.

5. Theisen, B.L., "The 13th Annual Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition: Intelligent Ground Vehicles Created by Intelligent Teams" **SPIE International Symposium Optics East**, Boston, MA, October 23-26, 2005.

6. Theisen, B.L., M.R. DeMinico, G.D. Gill, "The Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition: Team Approaches to Intelligent Driving and Navigation," NDIA Paper No. IVSS-2005-UGV-07, **NDIA Intelligent Vehicle Systems Symposium & Exhibition**, Traverse City, MI, June 13-16, 2005.

7. Theisen, B.L., D. Maslach, "The 12th Annual Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition: Team Approaches to Intelligent Vehicles" **SPIE International Symposium Optics East**, Philadelphia, PA, October 25-28, 2004.

8. Theisen, B.L., G.R. Lane, "The 11th Annual Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition: Team Approaches to Intelligent Driving and Machine Vision," **SPIE International Symposium Optics East**, Providence, RI, October 27-30, 2003.

9. Agnew, W.G., G.R. Lane, Ka C. Cheok, Hall, E.L., D.J. Ahlgren, "The Intelligent Ground Vehicle Competition (IGVC): A Cutting-Edge Engineering Team Experience," **American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition**, 2003.

10. Agnew, W.G., G.R. Lane, KaC. Cheok, "Intelligent Vehicles Designed by Intelligent Students," SAE Paper No. 2002-01-0404, **SAE International Congress**, Detroit, MI, March 4-7, 2002.

ADDITIONAL SOURCES

Complete rules and other information about the IGVC can be obtained from the website www.igvc.org or by contacting us at (586) 574-8750.

Figure 11: SUNY University at Buffalo – Big Blue, on the Navigation Challenge Course.